DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 750 SO 017 873

AUTHOR Colarulli, Guy C.; D'Lugin, Victor F.
TITLE Political Science, Political Scientists, and the Baccalaureate Reform Movement.
PUB DATE Aug 86
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (Washington, DC, August 28-31, 1986).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bachelors Degrees; *College Curriculum; *Curriculum Design; Curriculum Development; Curriculum Problems; Higher Education; *Integrated Curriculum; *Political Science; Teaching Methods; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

This article reviews the Association of American Colleges' (AAC) report titled "Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community" in terms of its relevance to political science instruction at the undergraduate level. The report examines two issues: (1) political science as a core component of a general education curriculum; and (2) the role of the undergraduate major in political science. A shift in focus from the faculty as teacher to the student as learner is recommended. This requires an examination of all elements of the baccalaureate program in terms of the perspective of goals or outcomes the students must achieve upon completion of the degree. Specialization in undergraduate education helps to develop higher levels of sophisticated analytical ability. Integrative courses constructed with a unifying focus and a plan for sequential learning allow for a synthesis of knowledge and the development of critical thinking skills. An undergraduate political science curriculum with this approach is more coherent than the randomness that pervades most baccalaureate degrees today. (KWL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED288750

Political Science, Political Scientists, and the Baccalaureate Reform Movement

Guy C. Colarulli and Victor F. D'Lugin

University of Hartford
West Hartford, Connecticut

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S.R. Kopper

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for delivery at the 1986 Annual Meeting of
The American Political Science Association,
The Washington Hilton, August 28-31, 1986.
Copyright by the American Political Science Association

SO017873

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

During the past year, three major national reports have been issued assessing the state of undergraduate education in the United States. [Association of Americn Colleges' "Integrity in the College Curriculum", National Institute of Education's "Involvement in Learning", and the National Endowment for the Humanities' "To Reclaim a Legacy".] All three reports have argued that the baccalaureate is in disarray and in need of serious rethinking. The three reports, although different in tone and in some significant areas of substance, call into question what we are doing in the design and presentation of curriculum.

Substantively the Associaton of American Colleges' (AAC) report, "Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community" is perhaps the most comprehensive and suggestive of areas in need of reexamination. This article begins with a review of the AAC report in terms of its relevance to the teaching and learning of political science at the undergraduate level. We examine what the report has to say in two basic areas: the role and responsibility of political science as a component of a core or general education curriculum; and the role of the undergraduate major in political science. The review that follows is selective. We are concerned here, not with an endorsement or critical assessment of the AAC report as a whole, but rather with selected aspects of the report that we feel are particularly relevant to political science departments primarily teaching undergraduates.

"Integrity in the College Curriculum," argues that the baccalaureate degree has lost much of its meaning and coherence. "As for what passes as a college curriculum, almost anything goes. We have reached a point at which we are more confident about the length of a college curriculum than its content or purpose." (p.2) The report finds confusion and a loss of coherence in all three parts of the baccaluareate: the major, the general education or core requirements, and electives.

> The undergraduate major ... everywhere dominates, but the nature and degree of concentration varies widely from college to college. Indeed, the major in most colleges is little more than a gathering of courses taken in one department, lacking structure or depth...The Chairman of the Committee on Economic Education for the American Economic Association, in a letter to the AAC, recently admitted that 'we know precious little about what the economics major is or what it does for students' and then remarked that it is unlikely, whatever the major or institution, that the average graduating senior 'has any integrated sense of his major discipline and its link to other fields of inquiry.' (p.2)

The rationale for the major, although usually not stated, in many institutions is a "low level" introduction to the doctoral studies program either offered at that institution or the one experienced by the faculty as part of their training. The irony of treating an undergraduate major as a watered down or pale reflection of a Ph.D. curriculum is that the undergraduate student too often ends up, at best, with discrete bodies of facts that are of little use intellectually or pragmatically, and often not even knowing what the discipline she or he has studied is all about.

Similarly, electives are too often used, the report believes, to "fatten majors" and as a result to "diminish breadth". Electives, not having any independent purpose, are usually vechicles for students to take more courses within a department or simply to acquire credits necessary for a degree. Rarely are they used to seek a broader or more sophisticated understanding wherein learning is the goal.

The traditional breadth portion of the baccaluareate, general education, has itself been subject of much discussion and reform since Harvard revised its requirements in the late 1970's. Nevertheless, the report finds that at most colleges the general education requirements, where they do exist, also "lack a rationale and cohesion." (p.3) We have all heard our colleagues tell an advisee that general education or breadth requirements are something you have to get over (as quickly as possible) so that you can get to the important courses in the major (where real knowledge is). While it can be argued that breadth is provided by the diversity of experiences offered to students in the variety of courses presented, learning is left to accident - it is not planned or even made more likely.

The report suggests that with electives and general education requirements merely an extension of and/or obstacle to an ill or non-defined major, it is no wonder that the meaning and coherence of the undergraduate curriculum has been brought into question. A baccaluareate without some form of overt or rationalized coherence seems to be the norm, not the exception. "Does it make sense for a college to offer a thousand courses to a

student who will only take 36?" (p 2).

Much of the blame for the present state of the undergraduate curriculum has been placed on departments -- not disciplines. Responsibility for disciplines, the report argues, was given to departments. Those structures, not so suprisingly, soon became responsive to their own needs, maintenance, and growth. No one, as a result, was responsible for maintenance and growth of the undergraduate curriculum as a whole or even that part of the B.A. called general education. In the words of the report:

> Faculty control over the curriculum became lodged in departments that developed into adept protectors and advocates of their own interests, at the expense of institutional responsibility and curricular coherence.... The consequence of the dispersal of authority over the curriculum is the unhappy disarray, the loss of integrity in the bachelor's degree...(pp. 4-5)

Faculty control over the curriculum should be primarily lodged in the whole undergraduate college, or put differently faculty "turf" should be the entire undergraduate curriculum. An interest in an undergradute curriculum should not be based merely on the desire to secure for the political science department its share of the enrollment pie.

Taking seriously the evaluation of the present state of the undergraduate curriculum, presented above, this article examines the vision of the baccalaureate developed by the AAC report. Then, this vision will inform our discussion of political science's role in the component parts of the baccalaureate. As the discussion will make clear, political science has a special role to play in the education of an undergraduate.

A Vision of the Baccalaureate

The goal of an undergraduate education is to enable, ideally even empower, the individual to live a full and satisfying life by developing the ability to learn and by seeing learning as a life-long endeavor. In the words of the AAC report, "[w]e do believe that there are methods and processes, modes of access to understanding and judgment, that should inform all study." (p. 15) An undergraduate education should empower the individual to better make his or her way in the world. Such an education involves a number of essential experiences including the acquisition of skills and "ways of growing and understanding." Specifically, the report lists the experiences that are deemed essential for an undergraduate education: 1. inquiry, abstract logical thinking, critical analysis; 2. literacy: writing, reading, speaking, listening; 3. understanding numerical data; 4. historical consciousness; 5. science; 6. values; 7. art; 8. international and multicultural experiences; and 9. study in depth [the major]. These experiences constitute what the report calls a minimum required undergraduate curriculum where student learning is the primary goal rather than a "concern for coverage and factual knowledge."

The report repeatedly assigns to the undergraduate curriculum another goal that has special importance for us as political scientists. It argues that an undergraduate education "makes a vital contribution to the health" of the political system.

> Leaders in a complex, pluralistic society require not only technical or professional expertise but the ability to make consequential judgments on issues involving the contextual understanding and assessment of multifaceted problems (p. i)...[A] time for making higher education the vital instrument for enabling generations of young men and women to grasp a vision of the good life...(p. 6) In the end, the quality of American life is at stake, the wisdom and humanity of our leaders, our ability as citizens to make informed choices, and dedication with which we exhibit humane and democratic values as we go through our daily lives. (p. 7)

Thus an undergraduate education should not only enable the individual to live a more effective, fuller life, but in the process empower him or her to be an effective, participating member of the polity. The discipline of political science, here, has a special contribution to make to the curriculum. This special contribution involves developing critical thinking skills, the ability to make informed political choices, and understanding the polity (its politics and processes), but not what to think, what to choose, or a one-sided understanding.

Hyperbole aside, it would seem that political science as a discipline can contribute to this goal as one of many disciplines within the academic community and can contribute specifically as the discipline that studies the actions of the polity and individuals and groups within any given polity.

General Education and Political Science

There is considerable discussion, if not debate, as to exactly what should constitute "general education" for the liberal arts or career-oriented college student. In talking about

general education we mean those courses that are required or are part of the requirements for all students in a particular college. These courses can be said to represent the "shared set" of learning experiences for students. General education requirements typically are seen as that part of the undergraduate experience that is attempting to assure breadth, commonality of experience, and therefore represents a major component of the rationale for undergraduate education. The general education curriculum can be seen as the first element in defining the meaning of college learning.

Gaff suggests that the common core experience should provide students with "familiarity with various branches of human understanding as well as the methodologies and languages particular to different bodies of knowledge. " (p. 7-8) Kemeny appears to support this understanding of general education and suggest a pragmatic rationale for arguing for breadth as the core of the shared experience. He states that we are truly unable to know precisely what concerns, problems or needs students will face in twenty or thirty years and therefore cannot provide them with only the "facts" that will be of import. We can not assume to know, and prehaps don't even wish to know, the exact requirements of the political , social, economic world our students will face. The undergraduate experience should therefore prepare students "no matter what the problems turn out to be thirty or thirty-five years from now. And that means what we have to give them is breadth of education that will prepare them not for the problems we know today, but for the problems we don't know today." (as quoted in Kolenbrander p.3.) Faculty and students

would agree that many of the facts and data taught in courses are quickly forgotten once a final examination is completed. It may be more important to concentrate on the ways of knowing and the desire to know than to concentrate exclusively on a list of facts and concepts to be memorized.

Among the typical options or types of general education requirements present are a core curriculum of specifically required courses usually drawn from traditional introductory level courses in a number of departments; or a "distribution" requirements that specifies a number of courses that must be taken in designated "areas" or "divisions" such as the "humanities", "social sciences", "mathematics and sciences." Recently some institutions, however, have created specifically designed courses and/or learning sequences that serve as general education requirements. These courses are sometimes designed around a common theme or goal, are generally interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary in content, and are directed toward some specific learning outcomes that includes the integration of disciplinary concepts and content. In this last option, general education requirements become a coherent part of the curriculum rather than simple exposure to a variety of areas.

Gaff supports such a general education curriculum when he states that it is necessary to view general education curriculum and each course within that curriculum as providing "integration, synthesis, and connectedness of knowledge", rather than providing some form of discrete discipline bound factual base. In 1960 in a

classic book on general education, Mayhew argued that definite steps must be taken to incorporate in such a curriculum some type of mechanisms for achieving integration. (p.19) Writing almost a quarter of a century later, the recognized general education experts Gamson and Nichols made the same case even more forcefully.

> Diversity implies nothing about how subjects are organized in relation to one another ... Subjects can be integrated with one another or the can be fragmented. One of the problems with current curricula is the failure to pay adequate attention to the connections among the subjects taught [Conrad and Wyer,1980:The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching 1977]. This is a serious failure; for a long time the essence of a liberal education has been seen to be the development of an integrative habit of mind [Newman [1852, 1959]. Arguments for integration continue today [Hazzard 1979]. Researchers are beginning to come up with evidence showing that curricula enocouaging the integration of and ideas skills produce the greatest growth in their students capacity to think critically. Whereas distribution requirements without an integrative rationale do not have this effect. [Winter, McClelland, and Stewart 1981; Forrest, 1981]. (Gamson, p. 125-6)

The addition of integrative courses to a general education curriculum can provide such a "mechanism" and assurance that "integration" is a part of that curriculum. Integration, it should be understood from above, has meaning for curriculum and student learning. Integration is a curricular and course goal that seeks a synthesis of ideas and makes clear the relationships and wholeness of knowledge. Integration is also an important element in intellectual development and student learning; learning to integrate ideas and course material is an important element in improving thinking skills. Therefore, such general education courses are designed to develop thinking skills through

special attention to exploring and understanding relationships among ideas and disciplines.

The common link in most discussions and approaches to general education is that general education must first be viewed as a curriculum not as a list of courses thrown together. As a curriculum it must have stated goals and outcomes and that each piece must contribute to the accomplishment of the goals. The best way to accomplish this task, typically, is to design courses specifically for general education needs. Such courses would be directed toward general education goals and not primarily to department or disciplinary goals. The particular form developed by a college should reflect its strengths and resources.

In a typical general education curriculum, political science is generally considered a component of core courses or requirements in many colleges and universities. INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE or INTRODUCTION TO AMERICAN GOVERNMENT are usually found as either specifically required courses or are prominently placed within a laundry list of required courses. In either case, students take a political science course that is part of a department's curriculum and serves in part or in whole as an introduction to the discipline.

American government courses, in particular at the freshman level, have generally responded to two basic goals or intents: to acquaint students with the institutions and processes of the American political system, and to serve as a gateway to additional courses in political science or the academic study of politics. Within the discipline there are numerous approaches,

analytical paradigms and perspectives for teaching American government; a review of sub-titles and marketing materials for the too numerous to count, American government texts currently available makes this clear. While these approaches differ greatly in their implications for teaching and studying the American polity, they generally share a common purpose. The goal of introductory courses in American government or politics is to provide a comprehensive (read exhaustive) overview of all components and aspects of American politics and prepare or induce students to take more courses in political science, and even perhaps as a distant goal to become part of the scholarly activity of being a political scientist.

Instead of designing an introductory course assuming that the student will be taking a number of additional political science courses, we suggest, as does the general education literature, a different view. We should be asking what we wish to impart to students, if we assume that this is the only political science course they will ever take.(Mayhew in Gaff, p. 110). A course developed based on this latter assumption is more likely to serve the learning needs of the general education student. Also, such a change in direction or focus is part of recognizing that the general education component of the baccalaureate is a curriculum in itself and again, each course ought to contribute to that curriculum. "[Basic] curricular questions should be addressed not by looking at sub-fields within the discipline, but by considering more generally the purpose of a liberal education and the place of political science therein."

(Steinberger, p.1) A general education political science course that is part of such a curriculum will have less coverage in order to pursue General Education goals, but will provide an opportunity for a better understanding of the material that is covered and likely result in greater interest and retention.

The realization that most students who take our introductory courses are not going to be political science majors and fewer still, if any will pursue a masters or doctorate in political science is a significantly more logical and parsimious assumption than the one we traditionally start off with. If this is the case, then we need to address the needs of the overwhelming number of students who are likely to take one General Education course with us.

Given this altered perspective, we would like to suggest that not only is there a role for the study of politics and government in general education courses but that it is a unique role and one that we should explore. Ideally, general education and liberal education seem to be concerned with developing within students an "enabling" or "enpowering" capacity. It would seem to be difficult to fully operationalize such constructs and, even once operationalized, find a means of placing them within specific courses. We might agree that some component of "enpowering" in the contemporary world necessarily includes an understanding of one's relation to the state and to all those institutions that effect an individual's life. Part of enabling ought to include being able to recognize, understand, analyze and influence the distribution of power. Political science clearly can contribute to such an understanding. The point, here, is to

suggest that the main or primary goal of a general education course in political science might not be to understand a particular set of institutional arrangements at a particular moment in time within a given polity, but to acquaint students with the processes by which power and scarce resources are distributed and thus to foster "political understanding within our students." (Leege, p.1) In a general education course the study of a particular system may be the means used but it should not be the primary end.

Political science attempts to understand how people, individually and in groups go about the process of making critical choices among conflicting goals, values, and needs. We examine the implications for individuals, groups, and nations of the choices polities make, and examine the group decision making process itself. In an Introduction to American Politics course, the specific "case study" we use is the United States of America. In a graduate level course preparing students for scholarly work we may in deed be rightly concerned with the degree to which a students "knows" all the components and variables contributing to particular outcomes at a particular time. In the general education course (and later we will discuss the major as well) something other than coverage of all aspects of the system, its operational parts, and varied impact on decisions is required. We would seem to be more properly concerned with the generalizability of that knowledge to an understanding of the process of decision making and the general analytical approach used. Again, content becomes a vehicle or case study to explore how and with

what implications people(s) make decisions in the public arena.

The appropriate content of a general education course studying politics and government may be identified as form of "political efficacy." As such the goal would be to impart to students both the cognitive skill and the affective confidence necessary to begin to feel competent in the political world. While political science can not and should not be responsible alone for "creating" empowered individuals, we can provide a significant part of the necessary knowledge. Political science which has always combined normative analysis and empircial inquiry, as well as providing varied metaphores and methodologies necessary for critical thinking, seems especially suited for this task. (see: Leege, Steinberger) Introductory to American government courses can include participatory activities as part of the curriculum. Issues of both NEWS FOR TEACHERS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE and PS have examined the applied and pedagogical implications of "citizenship" education for American government classes. Students can be required, as part of their course work, to engage in forms of political participation either on campus and/or on the local, state or national level. Such activities might include gathering data on individuals in position of formal and informal authority and on issues, conducting polls, contacting interest groups and elected officials, developing position papers, monitoring news programs around specific issues, and participating in simulations. What makes these activities diffferent from traditional out of class requirements is that they are constructed and evaluated not on the cognitive knowledge

acquired but on the skill and affect outcomes that come from engaging in action within a political process. These activities are only example of the type of modifications that do seem to increase a sense of political efficacy for students without endorsing any particular political process or ideology.

Political science also has a role to play in general education as part of the social sciences. Much of the discussion above centered on the fact that general education is concerned with developing the critical thinking and critical acting skills of students. For our students, the departmental and even disciplinary divisions that are so important to us are not only not known but to a significant degree irrelevent. Too often an introductory discipline course from one of the social sciences is presented as if the other social sciences don't exist. As a social science we share some concerns, perspectives and modes of inquiry with all the social sciences. An understanding of this shared or common knowledge would best serve our students. We suggest that one approach to general education would be the creation of integrative courses which present to students common concerns and varied approaches to problem solving and knowledge accumulation in the social sciences. These integrative courses would permit students to see the variety of modes of inquiry available without loosing sight of the particular contribution of each discipline. Such courses could be organized around common themes....such as power, human nature, authority , or development. Again while the theme or selected content is important (providing students with a factual base), learning to

integrate the material, to become familiar with various modes of inquiry and to see similarities and differences among disciplines, are the principle learning goals of such a course.

There are a number of program efforts in this regard that have been shown to be successful. Among these is a "Sources of Power" course offered at the University of Hartford (and a similiar course , "People, Power, Politics," that is part of the Brooklyn College core curriculum). "Sources of Power" was developed by a psychologist, political scientist, and a sociologist. After considering a number of concepts the three disciplines share, it was agreed to concentrate on power as the unitifying theme for course development (others could just as easily been used). The three faculty then designed a course that presented an integrated understanding of what psychology, polticial science and sociology have to say about power. As part of the course, students developed, not only an appreciation of various modes of inquiry but also some appreciation of the commonality and differences among the three disciplines.

Political Science and the Major

If the general education needs of students has attracted at least some attention in the past two decades the same can not be said for the undergraduate "major." The AAC reports offers a perspective on an undergraduate major -- what they prefer to call a study indepth -- which is very compelling.

The report recognizes that coverage in an undergraduate major is no longer possible. As with most disciplines in the liberal arts and sciences, we have grown to such an extent that

coverage as the primary goal of a baccalaureate major is unrealistic. If our concern were to be coverage how many courses would be necessary for a major? How many fields, sub-fields and specific content areas, historical periods, and methodological approaches would been needed to complete a major? Surely we can see that the profusion of the discipline has made coverage an unworkable goal for the undergraduate major.

In addition, to the extent that there is a lack of agreement as to the boundaries of and relationships within a discipline, creating a major that attempts coverage seems foolhardy. It is questionable as to whether any discipline, and certainly our own discipline, can or should define its exact limits and yet such an activity is necessary if the call is for coverage in an undergraduate major in political science. This activity may be of doubtful lasting validity and would certainly raise issues for departments and faculty that would seem at best self-destructive and time consumming.

While some majors attempt coverage, others majors are constructed on a different basis with not necessarily the student in mind. The report describes some existing majors as "not so much experiences in depth as they are bureaucratic conveniences: they allow professors to indulge their professional preoccuptions and they allow deans to control the flow of student traffic." (p 27).

We can learn from these two approaches to constructing a major. As part of the goal of coverage is a legitimate desire for students to develop a relatively sophisticated understanding of the discipline, or to put it in the terms of the AAC report, a

study indepth. Basing a major strictly on the typically narrow specializations usually of a few faculty while indulgent, does emphasize the need to select substantive "areas" with which faculty are engaged as an important way of engaging students. The challenge therefore, is to do both: develop a major that develops a sophisticated (but not possibly comprehensive) understanding of the discipline AND that covers areas in which faculty are enthusiastic to better involve students.

Much of the undergraduate curriculum reform movement, it should be understood, involves a fundamental re-orientation for faculty. This change in focus or orientation, put perhaps too simply, is from an emphasis on faculty teaching to one on student learning. A study in depth needs to be constructed to achieve learning goals for students not primarily topical teaching goals of faculty. This argument is not made simply because 99% of our students will not go on to graduate school, but also because to prepare and teach courses in the major as substantive prerequisites in preparation for an unlikely to be taken graduate program is to not only fail students but also to fail the discipline. A study in depth argues that political science can provide a valuable leaning experience for undergraduates when it is constructed with their needs in mind. A similar statement can be made for most of the traditional liberal arts majors. What role has a major in the undergraduate curriculum? How should the undergraduate major in political science be constructed?

The function of a major in the baccaluareate is to provide a study indepth in a focused area. To achieve that end, a major must be planned to assure increasing academic discipline and

learning. An undergraduate major then should be constructed to make likely sequential/developmental learning. Study in depth, in the words of the AAC report,

> ...requires sequential learning, building blocks of knowledge that lead to a more sophisticated understanding and encourage leaps of imagination and efforts at synthesis. Depth is achieved through a variety of experiences that broaden the student's knowledge of a discipline,strengthening analytical powers while leading to a deeper, fresher, more complex perspective." (p.24)

Learning in the major needs to be sequential not only in terms of developing subject specific knowledge but also to plan for and better assure an increasingly sophisticated understanding. Within the discipline and particularly within the undergraduate major, emphasis must be placed on synthesis of material within and among fields. While we should not fabricate the notion that the discipline is presently a "whole cloth", there exists sufficient and numerous strands that permit integration. Put simply, courses in the major should whenever possible be integrative.

The major "cannot be restricted to the offerings of one department." While the example the AAC uses is history, it can easily be applied to political science:

> History is almost everywhere in the curriculum: to limit a history concentration to history department courses may serve the ambitions of a department but will certainly deny students the strengthening of their study in depth with a course in the history of English literature, the art of the Renaissance, or a history of economic thought - all offered outside the department. (p. 28)

The report warns however, against creating a major which is a hodgepodge. Such courses must be included in the major within a

plan. To accomplish its function in the baccalaureate the major must be more than ten or twelve courses randomly selected from dozens a department offers. The study in depth accentuates the needs for students to develop a facility with complex structures of knowledge. Depth therefore does not reject specialization and does not call for professors to teach only generalized courses, but rather suggests that we must reject haphazzard offerings within specialization which do not permit students to develop the ability to deal with greater and greater complexity with increasing sophistication.

Specialization, if anything would appear to be enhanced by the report's recommendations. Specialization would serve as the means by which we as political scientists must make the choice as to what substantive bodies of knowledge and analytical means are necessary to communicate to our non -graduate students. Actual course work would rely on our specializations. We are teaching substance and that substance is our continued committment to our area of knowledge. However, we must simultaneously recognize that for the undergraduates student the substantive area is primarily analytical skill and methodological ability in dealing with ever increasing levels of depth, complexity and sophistication. Our area should be for them a means. Our main goal is not "to fill in substantive gaps in our course offerings. Rather we should be insuring that our students receive exposure to the basic intellectual strategies of the discipline..." (Steinberger, p.1) And finally our specialzation is hopefully the means by which we retain enthusaism for the area, the discipline, and teaching.

The undergraduate major should be constructed taking advantage of the specializations and resources of each particular department, but with a plan for sequential learning that leads to a sophisticated understanding of the discipline. This structure might be organized around a theme, a focus, central questions in the discipline, or methodological perspectives or any other relevant unifying element. The unifying element serves to use the expertise of the department to engage students in learning political science. To accomplish these goals, a carefully constructed plan for the major must be designed. Such a major will likely have less choices for students but with a greater chance of achieving an ordered and more coherent understanding of the discipline.

Conclusion

The Association of American Colleges' report, "Integrity in the College Curriculum," offers significant and, more importantly, useful insights concerning the undergraduate programs offered in many colleges and universities. This article has attempted to discuss some of the reports major implications for the teaching and learning of political science.

The report suggests that administrators and faculty begin to reeaximine not only the baccalaureate experience of students, but the orientation of faculty to that experience. One suggestion that emerges from the report is the need to concentrate on the student as learner as opposed to the faculty as teacher. This

orientation would lead faculty to examine all elements of the baccaluareate (general education, the major, and electives), from the perspective of goals or outcomes we would wish students to achieve upon completion of their degree. To accomplish this task it would be necessary to view the entire bachelor's degree as a curriculum and as the responsibility and concern of the faculty as a whole. The suggestion made here is that discipline, department or specialization are important components of faculty expertise, but that all members of the academic community must begin to examine the "whole" and in doing so find the appropriate place within that whole for their particular discipline and specialization. In brief, the undergraduate curriculum and its component parts should be designed to accomplish carefully articulated learning goals.

Specialization is an important component of an undergraduate education, but principally as a means for faculty to use their knowledge and skills to provide the sound educational experience, described in the report, for the student who will leave academia upon completion of the bachelor's. The report suggests that the concern of the undergraduate student should be to develop ever increasing levels of sophisticated analytical ability. Political science, by its long history of combining various modes of analysis, analytical perspectives, and normative and empirical concerns, is especially well suited to assist in this movement.

Integrative courses are particularly useful in the general education and major curricula, because they allow for a synthesis

of discipline knowledge. For students this synthesis is useful as an aspect of learning to think critically and as a way of making clear the connectedness of knowledge. Integrative courses that are constructed within a unifying focus and plan for sequential learning maximizes student learning. Taken as a whole, such an undergradute curriculum is inherently more coherent than the randomness that pervades most baccalaureate degrees today.

REFERENCES

Association of American Colleges. 1985. Project on Redefining the Meaning and Purpose of Baccalaureate Degrees. Integrity in the College Curriculum: A Report to the Academic Community. Washington, D.C.: Association of American Colleges.

Gaff, Jerry G. 1983. General Education Today. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gamson, Zelda and Associates. 1984. Liberating Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kolenbrander, Harold M. 1982. "On Balance: Promoting the Liberal Arts." Liberal Education no 68, (Spring 1982).

Leege,David C. 1984."Political Science and General Eduation: Bridging Metaphysics, Theory and Practice." News for Teachers of Political Science no 40, (Winter 1984).

Mayhew, Lewis B. 1960. General Education: An Account and Appraisal. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Steinberger, Peter. 1985. "Objectives of the Undergraduate Curriculum." News for Teachers of Political Science no 46(Summer 1985).